

**Draft Summary of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
January 31, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group on January 31, 2002 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Land Use Study 1 (Land Use)
Attachment 5	Land Use Study 2 (Land Management)
Attachment 6	Land Use Study 3 (Comprehensive Plan Consistency Evaluation)
Attachment 7	Land Use Study 4 (Aesthetics)
Attachment 8	Land Use Study 5 (Fuel Load Management)

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – November 13, 2001 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the November 13, 2001 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #LU26:	Confirm that issue raised related to traffic signage indicating alternative routes to Oroville Recreation facilities is incorporated in Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group study plans.
Status:	Jim Upholt of DWR informed the Work Group that the individual who had raised this issue submitted a written comment regarding this issue during the comment period for Draft NEPA Scoping Document 1 and CEQA Notice of Preparation. Alternative route traffic signage to the Oroville recreation facilities will be addressed in the Recreation and Socioeconomics study plan that evaluates barriers to recreation. This individual has been added to the project mailing list.
Action Item #LU27:	Obtain Butte County Bicycle Plan for inclusion in SP-L3.
Status:	Jim Upholt and Jim Martin reported that acquisition of the Butte County Bicycle Plan has been initiated. They learned that the consulting team has acquired a copy of the Oroville General Plan that includes some information related to the City's plans for bike trails. The County's Bicycle Plan will be acquired and DWR will follow-up on this action item.
Action Item #LU28:	Coordinate with the Environmental Study Plan Task Force developing SP-T11 and Peter Maki for local input on further development of Study Plan SP-L5 (Fuel Load Management) for inclusion (may be placeholder) in study package to Plenary Group.

Status: Jim Martin contacted Steve Ford on this issue and there are plans to meet with him in the future to coordinate efforts between SP-T11 and SP-L5. There has been no contact with Peter Maki. SP-L5 was included in the study plan package that went to the Plenary Group in December 2001.

Action Item #LU29: Provide recommended draft study plans SP-L1 (Land Use), SP-L2 (Land Management), SP-L3 (Comprehensive Plan Consistency Evaluation), and SP-L4 (Aesthetics) for inclusion in study plan package to be presented at Plenary Group December 11th meeting.

Status: All four of the above-reference study plans, as well as SP-L5 (Fuel Load Management), were included in the study plan package that was presented at the Plenary Group meeting in December 2001.

Plenary Group December 11 Meeting Update

The Facilitator led the discussion summarizing the December 2001 and January 2002 Plenary Group meetings. A complete set of relicensing study plans was submitted to participants at the December 11, 2001 Plenary Group meeting as scheduled. At the January 2002 Plenary Group meeting, participants were asked to identify their 'heartburn' issues with those study plans identified as "critical-path". Critical Path refers to those study plans that either need two full years of data collection, have time-sensitive issues related to data collection, or will produce information needed for other study plans. Twenty-two study plans were identified as critical-path, including Land Use study plans SP-L1 and SP-L4. The Plenary Group participants identified 'heartburn' issues with twelve of the twenty-two study plans and referred them back to the appropriate Work Groups for resolution. The remaining Critical Path Study Plans that had no heartburn issues identified were placed on a consent calendar for approval at the February Plenary Group meeting. Both of the Land Use Critical Path Study Plans were placed on the consent calendar. Once the Work Groups have resolved the issues identified, revised Study Plans will be provided to the Plenary Group participants and reviewed at the February Plenary Group meeting for inclusion on the consent calendar for approval. Once approved, these studies can begin implementation either through fieldwork or the development of more detailed implementation plans or both.

The Facilitator informed the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group that one significant general issue was raised at the January 2002 meeting associated with the use of modeling in the study plans. A modeling review protocol Task Force was initiated, consisting of both modelers and non-modelers. The Task Force was charged with developing a generic modeling review protocol to ensure transparency, clarity, and confidence in all models to be used during the relicensing study plans.

Another overarching issue that was raised at the Plenary Group meeting in January was the overall project schedule. The discussion focused on when study-generated data was going to be needed for effective settlement negotiation and development of appropriate environmental documentation; April 2004 was suggested as the appropriate target date. This led to a discussion of the very tight timeframe we are faced with. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group participants discussed the need for early access to data and feedback to the Work Groups on a regular basis as well as the need for multi-work group and task force coordination for efficient transfer of needed data between groups.

Study Plan Review

The study plan review focused on reviewing and revising Study Plan SP-L5 (Fuel Load Management). This study plan was not fully developed or reviewed by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group prior to being submitted to the Plenary Group in December 2001. A complete set of the most recent Land Use study plans was available to the Work Group and is provided as Attachments 4-8.

Land Use Study Plan 5 (Fuel Load Management)

Mark Greenig with EDAW led the discussion on SP-L5. Mark informed the group that the consultant team and DWR met with representatives of the California Department of Forestry (CDF) to discuss fuel load management issues. Results of the meeting will be added to the study plan text, where appropriate. The Work Group was informed that CDF indicated interest in meeting with the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. Mark explained that the purpose of this study is not to develop a fire plan; instead, its purpose is to identify key issues surrounding fuel load management in the study area and to identify techniques to address this potential problem. The Kelly Ridge area was discussed with CDF representatives as an area identified by work group participant of concern in terms of fire hazard; this area may be specifically referenced in the study plan text. The need to address ongoing management/maintenance of high-risk fire hazard areas was discussed with CDF.

Text revisions to this study plan were made “real-time” by the participants and recorded by the Facilitator. Overall, the revisions focused on adding text to reflect the need to address ongoing management options and prioritizing geographic areas of importance. Roger Calloway representing Department of Parks and Recreation added that their local personnel are interested and experienced in fuel load management issues, including specific management techniques.

One participant requested that a study objective be added related to evaluating if project facilities and operations conform to existing State and local fuel load management plans; this objective was added.

The discussion on the General Approach section of the study plan was initially concentrated on the GIS data and capabilities available to implement this study. DWR informed the group that it does have the capabilities to access and process available GIS data, including data developed by CDF.

Other concerns that the participants discussed include the need to coordinate this study with several of the other Land Use studies, the need to include all of the appropriate issue statements, and the fact that the study schedule should be more reflective of its non-critical-path nature.

Land Use Study Plans 1-4

Because the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group already reviewed and approved Land Use Study Plans L1, L2, L3, and L4 at the November 2001 meeting, there was a consensus among the participants that there was no need to review them again at this meeting. However, the participants did indicate a desire to discuss implementation details, including more specific schedules, for each of these study plans as appropriate, particularly the two Critical Path study plans.

Mark Greenig pointed out that only SP-L1 is truly a Critical Path study plan although certain aspects of SP-L4, namely the need to take photographs, is a critical-path task in the sense that this data is needed by other Work Groups and it would be useful to take photos during various seasons. The participants concurred that due to the compressed overall schedule, all studies are in a sense time-sensitive however they all agreed that SP-L1 and SP-L4 should be completed first based on staffing considerations.

Next Meetings

The Facilitator presented the proposed 2002 Work Group and Plenary Group meeting schedule to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. The participants approved all of the scheduled Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting dates for 2002 and discussed the potential to hold the next Work Group meeting in Sacramento during daytime hours to share the burden of travel among the participants. The participants agreed to hold their next Work Group meeting in Sacramento and provide a toll-free call-in number for those unable to

attend in person. The next Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting will be:

Date: Tuesday, February 19, 2002
Time: 1:00 to 5:00 PM
Location: In Sacramento to be determined

Agreements Made

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to forward the revised Study Plan L5 to the Plenary Group for heartburn review.

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to hold some of their future Work Group meetings in Sacramento to accommodate those participants that travel from Sacramento and the Bay Area for the meetings.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #LU27: Obtain Butte County Bicycle Plan for inclusion in SP-L3

Responsible: DWR Staff

Due Date: February 19, 2002

Action Item #LU30: Discuss implementation plans for critical-path studies, specifically SP-L1

Responsible: Consultant team

Due Date: February 19, 2002